Page 5

## **REMARKS**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3 as being anticipated by Etherington (3,677,680) but has indicated that claim 2 would be allowable if writter in independent form.

He stated that the reason claim 2 is allowable is that none of the prior art of record taught an apparatus of claim 1 wherein

- (1) "the machine is a stamping press, the mount is a mandrel with a cylindrical surface designed for sliding contact with a workpiece and . . ."
- (2) "the passageway in the mount has a first portion that extends radially inwardly from said cylindrical surface and a second portion that extends axially of the mandrel from the radially inward end."

Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the above part (2) of the features of claim 2 quoted by the Examiner as not being taught by the prior art and has added a new claim 6, dependent from claim 1, that recites the remaining features quoted by the Examiner. The remaining claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled.

"AND METHOD," to reflect the previous withdrawal of method claims 4 and 5 in response to the Examiner's previous requirement for restriction.

Applicant submits that the application is therefore in condition for allowance of apparatus claims 1 and 6, the only claims remaining in the application.

Independent Claim 1 is allowable because, as the Examiner noted, the Etherington (3,677,680) reference fails to disclose a vacuum sensing passageway that extends radially inwardly from the contact surface that contacts the tubular wall of the workplece.

Claim 6, dependent from claim 1 adds the details of a specific embodiment of the invention, namely a machin that is a stamping press, whos mount for the workpi ce is a mandrel, in which the radially inwardly vacuum sensing passageway is located.

Application/Control Number 09/879,760
Art Unit: 1722

Pag 6

Respectfully submitt d,

Frank C. Manak III
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 22044
21 Keswick Drive
Hudson OH 44236-3316
Tel. No. 330-656-1751